

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 14, and 15 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-20 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. Shanklin, Salapura, and Blair do not teach, either singly or in combination, a plurality of processors each “configured to perform concurrently two or more network flow analysis related tasks and data packets are assigned to processors in a manner that enables use of the respective processors to be maximized even if the split of information flows between tasks is uneven,” as recited in claims 1, 14, and 15 as amended. Support for the amendment is found in the present application at page 14, lines 14-17. Compare Salapura at column 7, lines 31-35, suggesting that the hash function distributes packets “uniformly” on a sequence basis and that doing so is sufficient alone to ensure “efficient exploitation of the overall system.” As such, claims 1, 14, and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Likewise, claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/28/07



William J. James  
Registration No. 40,661  
V 408-973-2592  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014